LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U. S.

Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
MAR 27 1970
JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1970

No. 114

CORLON C. KELLER,

Petitioner,

vs.

THE DEPARTMENT OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

Respondent.

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

BURTON MARKS, ESQ.
MARKS, SHERMAN and LONDON
9720 Wilshire Boulevard
Beverly Hills, Calif. 90212
Telephone - (213) 278-2301

Attorney for Petitioner

Offset printed by: Dean-Standefer Co., 315 3rd St., Huntington Beach, Cal. 92646
(714)-536-7161

TOPICAL INDEX

	Page
Opinions Below	1
Jurisdiction	2
Statutes Involved	3
Questions Presented	4
Statement of the Case	4
Substantiality of the Questions	6
Argument	7
I California Business and Professions Code section 25601 is void for vagueness, since a man of ordinary intelligence could not govern his conduct in such a way as to avoid prosecution merely by reading the statute	7
II California Business and Professions Code section 25601, as applied, violates the First and Fourteenth Amendments; in that it unconstitutionally impresses an individual licensee to infringe his customers' guarantees of free speech and association	10
III California Business and Professions Code section 23090.5 is unconstitutional, in that it unreasonably discriminates between the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control and most other agencies, in that it exempts its findings of fact from judicial review	11

TOPICAL INDEX

Argument (cont'd) Page

IV

The failure of the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control to meet any of the issues presented by the petitioner at his license revocation hearing constituted a violation of due process, in that it denied petitioner his right to a fair hearing 13

Conclusion 15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

Cases

Boretta Enterprises v. Dept. of Alcoholic Beverage Control, 75 Cal.Rptr. 79 9

Bridges v. Wixon, 326 U.S. 179 13

Champlif Ref. Co. v. Corp. Comm'n, 286 U.S. 210 ..... 2, 7

Chaplinsky v. New Hampshire, 315 U.S. 568 11

Connally v. General Constr. Co., 269 U.S. 385 ..... 2, 8

Dept. of Alcoholic Beverage Control v. Superior Court for the County of Orange, 73 Cal. Rptr. 780 12

Douglas v. California, 372 U.S. 353 2

Evans v. Newton, 382 U.S. 296 11

Giaccio v. Pennsylvania, 382 U.S. 399 ..... 2, 8

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

Cases (cont'd)	Page
In re Davis, 242 Cal.App.2d 645	8, 9
Kingsley Int. Pic. Corp. v. Regents, 360 U.S. 684	11
Lanzetta v. New Jersey, 306 U.S. 451	2, 8
Marsh v. State of Alabama, 326 U.S. 501	11
Morey v. Doud, 354 U.S. 457	2
Morgan v. United States, 304 U.S. 1	14
Musser v. Utah, 333 U.S. 95	9, 10
Reitman v. Mulkey, 387 U.S. 364	11
Schenck v. United States, 249 U.S. 47	11
SEC v. Chenery Corp., 332 U.S. 194	14
SEC v. Chenery Corp., 318 U.S. 80	14, 15
Stirone v. United States, 361 U.S. 212	2
Terry v. Adams, 345 U.S. 461	11
The Universal Camera Corp. v. NLRB, 340 U.S. 474	13
United States v. Chicago, M., St. P. & P.R.R., 294 U.S. 499	15
Walker v. San Gabriel, 20 Cal.2d 879	13
Whitney v. California, 274 U.S. 357	11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

Statutes (United States)	Page
United States Constitution	
First Amendment	4, 6, 10
Fifth Amendment	4
Fourteenth Amendment	4, 5, 6, 10
28 U.S.C. 1257(2)	2
Statutes (California)	
California Constitution	
Article I, Sec. 21	6
Article VI, Sec. 10	5, 12
Business and Professions Code	
Sec. 23089	11
Sec. 23090	5, 11
Sec. 23090.3	3, 13
Sec. 23090.5	3, 11, 12
Sec. 25601	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10
Government Code	
Section 11501	14
Section 11513(c)	5
Section 11518	3, 5, 13, 14

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

October Term, 1969

No. .....

CORLON C. KELLER,

Petitioner,

vs.

THE DEPARTMENT OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

Respondent.

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

OPINIONS BELOW

This is an appeal from the Order of the Court of Appeal of the State of California; Second Appellate District, denying, without opinion or hearing, petitioner's statutory Petition for a Writ of Review brought to review the Order of the California Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board affirming the Order of the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control revoking petitioner's "on sale" beer license. The California Supreme